

14th March 1934]

(b) what the places are where these leper clinics are located and to be located;

(c) what the qualifications are of the doctors in charge of these clinics and what the remuneration that is paid to each one of them is;

(d) what the number is of patients that attended each one of these clinics during the period they have been in existence;

(e) what the nature is of the treatment that is given to the patients and what the period for which the patients are treated;

(f) whether any report has been called for or will be called for as to the progress made and the number of patients cured in the various centres; and

(g) what the total expenditure is that has been incurred by the Government for leper relief in South Arcot and Salem?

A.—(a) to (g) A statement^a showing the information is laid on the table.

Religious and Charitable Endowments

Relief to the destitute poor.

* 786 Q.—Mr. K. KESAVARAMAMURTI NAYUDU: Will the Hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government be pleased to state what action has been taken by the Government with regard to the resolution moved by the Maharaja of Pithapuram and passed in the Council in 1930 for affording relief to the destitute poor?

A.—The attention of the hon. Member is invited to G.O. No. 4122, L. & M., dated 3rd November 1931, which was placed on the table of the House at its meeting held on the 26th January 1932.

[Note.—An asterisk (*) at the commencement of a speech indicates revision by the Member.]

II.—VOTING OF DEMANDS FOR GRANTS FOR 1934-35.

DEMAND VIII—HEADS OF PROVINCES AND EXECUTIVE COUNCILS—RESERVED.

* The Hon. Sir MAHOMED USMAN:—“ Sir, on the recommendation of His Excellency the Governor, I move—

‘ that the Government be granted a sum not exceeding Rs. 3,72,900 under Demand VIII. Heads of Provinces and Executive Councils—Reserved.’ ”

* Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN:—“ Sir, I move that we now take up for consideration first, cut motion No. 364 given notice of by the Kumara-raja of Venkatagiri, Khan Bahadur Yahya Ali Sahib Bahadur, Rao Bahadur A. T. Pannirselvam and the Raja of Mirzapuram so that there

[Dr. P. Subbarayan]

[14th March 1934]

may be a discussion of the Joint Memorandum submitted by the Indian Delegation to the Joint Parliamentary Committee on Indian Constitutional Reforms. (Mr. Abdul Hameed Khan: 'I have also given notice of a cut motion to the same effect.') As the time allotted for the discussion of this Demand is only two hours and as this is the only opportunity that we will get to discuss this important question before the Joint Select Committee submit their proposals to Parliament, I submit that this matter may be taken up first and debated."

Mr. K. R. VENKATARAMA AYYAR:—"I second it."

* The Hon. Sir MAHOMED USMAN:—"I have no objection to that course if that is the desire of the House."

The House agreeing to this course the motion was adopted.

* Khan Bahadur YAHYA ALI SAHIB Bahadur:—"Mr. President, I move—

'that the allotment of Rs. 3,72,900 for Heads of Provinces and Executive Councils—Reserved—be reduced Rs. 100.'

The object I have mentioned in the printed paper is to discuss the need for supporting the Joint Memorandum submitted by the Indian Delegation to the Joint Parliamentary Committee on Indian Constitutional Reforms.

"Sir, hon. Members are aware that in the month of November last, the Members of the Indian Delegation presented a Joint Memorandum to the Joint Parliamentary Committee on the question of Reforms embodying their views on some of the more salient questions covered by the enquiry. That document is a historic document entitled to the greatest amount of consideration both by this Government and by the other Governments of this country. It is a sober and well-reasoned statement of the case of India with reference to most of the burning questions of the day. It is a matter of no small satisfaction to this country that practically all the interests represented on the Delegation have come to an agreement with reference to all the most vital questions affecting the problem. Sir, except in regard to one or two points with reference to which Colonel Gidney and one or two other Members have expressed dissent, there have been on every question agreement and unanimity reached. That is a significant fact which has to be kept in mind in considering how far His Majesty's Government should allow any agitation in the ranks of the die-hard elements to influence them in the matter of whittling down or modifying their own proposals submitted to the Joint Parliamentary Committee.

"Sir, the memorandum has very clearly analysed the various objections that have been raised with regard to the granting of the full measure of freedom or independence that is offered in the White Paper Scheme. To meet the attacks of Mr. Winston Churchill and some other personalities who are indulging in a tirade against the grant of Reforms to Indians, facts and figures have been put forward, which, I submit, are all unanswerable. On the question of progress achieved by the

14th March 1934]

[Mr. Yahya Ali]

Ministers to whom powers have been delegated under the Montagu-Chelmsford Scheme, the memorandum has conclusively shown that under the regime of Indian Ministers the progress achieved is not only proportionate to the extent of the scope they had having regard to the limitations that were placed upon them, but that the results appear to have been indeed marvellous. On the subject of communications, it has been shown how the road policy of the country has improved in recent years and how with the advent of the motor bus and the motor traffic the innermost parts of the country have been opened up. The question of education has generally received a great impetus and there has been admirable expansion in the direction of elementary education. So far as collegiate education is concerned it has been shown, with reference to facts and figures, that the proportion of persons having higher education is comparatively higher in this country than in most of the western countries. In the matter of medical relief and preventive medicine also sufficient progress has been made. These have been achieved in spite of the extraordinary difficulties in the matter of finance.

“ Sir, it has been conceded in the Montagu-Chelmsford Report that no responsibility could be real unless there has been a proportionate devolution of financial responsibility also. I believe His Majesty's Secretary of State for India in the course of his evidence before the Joint Parliamentary Committee also stated that by the transfer of responsibility His Majesty's Government meant transfer also of financial responsibility. No Minister can really wield any amount of responsibility unless a certain amount of financial responsibility is also given. We were attacking our own Ministers constantly in this House for their not showing sufficient progress in the field of Agriculture, in Industries and in various other directions. But we are aware, Sir, how they are unable to do much on account of their having no control over the finances of the Province. With all this, the memorandum has clearly furnished the proof that, in spite of these handicaps placed on them, our Ministers have achieved substantial progress. Therefore the objection taken to further advance is unfounded.

“ One other point I wish to mention and that is with reference to the simultaneous introduction of Federation with the grant of Provincial Autonomy. That is one feature on which too much stress cannot be laid. The three conditions pointed out in the White Paper, are firstly the formation of the Reserve Bank, secondly the accession to the Federation of a certain number of Indian States and thirdly the issue of a Proclamation which has to be acquiesced in by both Houses of Parliament. With reference to the first point, the Reserve Bank is a *fait accompli*. The difficulties adumbrated in the White Paper as regards the balancing of the budgets in the various Provinces and as regards the reduction of short-term loans and other financial obligations, have been surmounted. So far as the debt position is concerned, we are now assured that of the total debt of Rs. 1,212 crores that India owes, more than five-sixths is covered by productive assets and that only one-sixth remains covered by unallocated funds. But this amount is

[Mr. Yahya Ali]

[14th March 1934]

really not so great as to stand in the way of the grant of Federation. Anyhow the Reserve Bank has almost been established. Then, with regard to the accession of the Princes, we have an assurance from them that it would be possible within a year from this date to secure the adhesion of the number required in the White Paper. So that there is practically no difficulty in meeting the conditions laid down in the White Paper for the introduction of a system of Federation at the same time as the grant of Provincial Autonomy.

“ Sir, stress has been laid on the possible psychological effect of a settlement like this. But a certain amount of apprehension is entertained in Indian circles that possibly the introduction of Federation will be put off indefinitely. That, at all events, has to be removed. And in view of the fact that certain elements are working against the Indian Reforms, it is but fitting that the Reforms should be introduced as early as possible.

“ One or two other matters also I have to refer to, but I shall be brief in view of the fact that other hon. Members are desirous of speaking on this subject. I wish only to state one fact and that is that as many as five out of twelve of the signatories to this Joint Memorandum are Muslim Members of the Delegation. They have joined hands with the other Members of the Delegation, even though with reference to some questions the All-India Moslem League and the other bodies have come forward with special terms for their own communities seeing that the White Paper proposals do not go far enough to safeguard their own rights. It is significant that practically all the Muhammadan Members have given their assent to it. That being the case it is but natural that nothing more should be cut down from the privileges conceded to the Muslim community under the communal award. In conclusion I wish to impress upon His Majesty's Government that the most vital necessity of the occasion is that there should be no further delay in the granting of the Reforms. It is important that if at all we are to have any Reforms they should be given as early as possible, as otherwise if they come very late they may not be relished at all owing to the sickening feeling arising from hope deferred too long. With these words, Sir, I move the cut motion.”

11-15
a.m.

MR. ABDUL HAMEED KHAN:—“ Mr. President, Sir, I second the motion made by Mr. Yahya Ali supporting the Joint Memorandum of the Indian Delegation with regard to the White Paper proposals. Sir, it is an admitted fact that in this country the White Paper proposals have not been received with any appreciation, or rather, they have not been accepted by the people. The party which could have delivered the goods has stood out entirely and is opposed to the White Paper proposals *in toto*. They have found these proposals not only unsatisfactory, but in some cases retrograde, and on that account they have regarded the proposals not only as unfavourable to the interests of India but an obstacle and a source of danger to the freedom of the country and to its economic stability.

14th March 1934]

[Mr. Abdul Hameed Khan]

“ First of all, even with regard to the question of the Federation, as has been adumbrated in the White Paper, general opinion is against it and it regards it as only a hotch-potch of democratic Provinces and Indian States, which are nothing better than autocratic governments. Therefore the result is bound to be not democracy, but something which will be worse than the present form of Government, or at any rate, a form of Government as bad as it is now. Sir, the Joint Memorandum has been signed by the Liberal Leaders of the country, who co-operated with the Government, who attended the various meetings of the Round Table Conference, who believed that instead of standing aloof they would try to see whether the Government would not agree to so formulate proposals as to enable this country to achieve Dominion Status in a definite period of time. The White Paper proposals have not satisfied these conditions. The Delegates, amongst whom are included members of all communities and leaders of Hindus, Muslims, Christians and even Europeans and Anglo-Indians as well, have signed this Joint Memorandum, and they have made their own counter-proposals, so that, if the Joint Select Committee accepts their proposals, it will be possible for a very large section of people to accept the Constitution when it emerges from Parliament. Sir, it is a well-known fact that the Prime Minister of England, the other Ministers of His Majesty's Government, the Secretary of State himself and even the several Viceroy's of India have times out of number given pledges and assurances to the people of India, that what is aimed at in the new Constitution ultimately is Dominion Status. They have in so many words promised, and even in the Message of His Majesty the King that reference was made, and the assurance was given that ultimately the Constitution will result in the establishment of Dominion Status and in the award of freedom which is enjoyed by the several Dominions within the British Empire. But I am afraid, as I have stated once before, that if one peruses the White Paper proposals from the beginning to the end, one cannot come across even the mention of the words ‘ Dominion Status.’ Somehow or other those words are very carefully and sedulously kept out of the proposals. And this is due to the opposition that Government have met with from Mr. Churchill and his party. Thus Government have, in a way, given way to the agitation and protests of the Diehards. And so what is sought to be given by these proposals is only truncated democracy.

“ So far as Federal Legislatures are concerned we know that there will be representatives of the people in them both from British India and from Indian States; the latter will form in no small measure a block which will stand in the way of democratic advance. I hope, Sir, that the safeguards that have been sought to be made by the proposals of the Indian Delegation, will be accepted by the Joint Select Committee, namely, that there should be several restrictions on the rights and powers of the representatives of the Indian States with regard to voting, whenever subjects particularly pertaining to British India come up. If freedom is given to the representatives of the Indian States to vote side by side with the representatives of the British provinces on questions

[Mr. Abdul Hameed Khan]

[14th March 1934]

affecting British India alone, I am afraid, Sir, that the interests of British India will not only not advance, but to a very large extent be jeopardized. I am sure the Joint Parliamentary Committee will give its best consideration to the proposals contained in the Memorandum, that the powers of the Indian States representatives will be restricted so far as subjects affecting British India alone are concerned.

“ Even with regard to election to the Federal Legislature the Memorandum makes the proposal that direct election should be resorted to, instead of allowing indirect election as is proposed in the White Paper. They have very elaborately and very cogently argued in favour of direct election as opposed to indirect election adumbrated in the White Paper. With regard to the question of the powers of the Provincial Legislatures also, they have very definitely stated that there is no need for giving extraordinary powers to the Governors of Provinces even with regard to the minorities or the services. Sir Abdur Rahim in his note states emphatically that it is absolutely unnecessary to give Governors of Provinces any special powers or extraordinary powers for safeguarding the interests of the minorities and services, if those interests are safeguarded in the very Constitution itself.

“ With regard to the powers of the Ministers and with regard to the question of the transference of Law and Order, there is the danger of the Government and the Parliament succumbing to the protests and the agitation of the Diehards in England. I am afraid there is the danger of the Government making some distinction between Province and Province. It may be that there is some sort of terrorism in some parts of Bengal, and it is possible that because of that, in the new Constitution, Law and Order might not be transferred to the popular Ministers. I dare say that will be a dangerous thing for the Government to do. This will result in certain departments of the Government being regarded as antagonistic to the popular opinion and in being considered as an alien element in the administration of the Province. Therefore it is not advisable that the Joint Parliamentary Committee or Parliament itself should make an invidious distinction between Province and Province. I am sure that, when power is once transferred to the popular Ministers, it will be possible for them to control any movement which may be regarded as terrorist. We have seen in other Provinces, as well as in this Province, how Dyarchy has worked successfully; there has been perfect harmony in the Cabinet all along. So I fail to see any reason why this unity in the Cabinet should be disturbed.

“ So far as Federal subjects are concerned, unless financial responsibility is transferred fully to the people, I do not think any Indian would regard any transference of power as a real one at all. Unless we have fiscal responsibility transferred to the people of the country, I do not think any Constitution would be regarded as satisfactory. Sir Samuel Hoare himself in the course of his statement has said that no transfer of power can be real unless fiscal responsibility is transferred

14th March 1934]

[Mr. Abdul Hameed Khan]

to the people. Such being the case I hope that it will be possible for the Parliament to see that fiscal responsibility is transferred to the people.

“ Then the suggestion is to appoint a Financial Advisor. I hope it will be possible for the Parliament to see eye to eye with the Indian Delegation with regard to this matter, namely, that the Financial Advisor should be an Indian, and that he should be appointed from among the elected Members of the Federal Legislature. It seems the idea is to appoint a non-Indian and that too one who has not been elected to any of the Legislatures. If any such Financial Advisor is appointed, I am afraid there will be no real responsibility. Sir, as I said before, without financial responsibility, the responsibility that is sought to be given will be only a truncated responsibility. One other question that has been agitated by a very considerable section of the English people has been with regard to commercial discrimination. The Joint Memorandum has satisfactorily replied to that position. The signatories to that Memorandum have clearly stated that there is no need for any fear of that nature. When once real responsibility is given to the people of this country, the people will certainly recognize the necessity for continuing the friendship between England and India because the people of India believe that it will not be to their interests to break their friendship with the British people either politically or commercially. Therefore any such fear on the part of the Diehards has no foundation. But any safeguards in that respect will certainly not help to bring about that feeling and understanding which alone will be responsible for bringing about the result which is sought to be brought about by the Diehards themselves. In this connexion I may say that even in the Nehru Report, which is the report of the people belonging to Nationalistic school of thought, it has been clearly stated that nobody in this country is anxious that anything should be done which will be prejudicial to the British commercial interests who are carrying on their business lawfully in this country. Nothing will be done to seriously prejudice the interests of the commercial community, whether Indian or European.

11-30
a.m.

“ Now, Sir, I shall conclude by suggesting that it will be in the interests of both England and India if at least the recommendations of the Indian Delegation consisting of Hindus, Mussalmans and other communities, were accepted by the Joint Parliamentary Committee, as that is the minimum, the lowest minimum that any section of people of this country will be able to accept. No doubt, when once any Constitution is brought into existence, the people will come forward and try to work it; but, if the Government of Great Britain are anxious that the Constitution which they are anxious to introduce in this country should work satisfactorily and successfully, it should be the endeavour of the promoters or the persons who are concerned in the making of this Constitution to see that all those elements of friction which at present exist in the proposals contained in the White Paper are removed. If they are not removed, to the extent they continue to exist, I am afraid a very

[Mr. Abdul Hameed Khan]

[14th March 1934]

large section of the people of this country, the very large vocal section, will certainly not stand by the Constitution, but will continue to agitate as the introduction of a Constitution of this nature will not achieve any result which is sought to be achieved by its introduction."

* Rao Bahadur A. T. PANNIRSELVAM:—"Sir, in supporting the Joint Memorandum submitted to the Joint Parliamentary Committee by the Indian Delegation, I should like to begin with to urge the necessity for expediting the progress of Reforms. Sir, it is well over six years since the Simon Commission came over to this country. Since then we have been taken through various stages. We have had the Simon Commission, we have had the convening of the Round Table Conference, three sessions of which we have already had, and lastly we have had the Joint Select Committee, with the Indian Delegation. Agitations have been carried on in this country for all these six years, certain people in India always proclaiming that they were not satisfied with whatever proposals were put forward. Well, there has been an equally insistent section in England which has been agitating against the progress so far foreshadowed. There has been there what is termed the Diehard section which has availed itself of every possible method for educating public opinion in England as to the unfitness of this country for any sort of Self-Government, at least in the near future with the result that we here have been left in a very uncertain state of mind, uncertain as to exactly when the Reforms would come, uncertain again as to what those Reforms would be, whether those Reforms would be such as to satisfy the Indian opinion, whether they would be such as to induce the Indian people including the extreme section to satisfy themselves at least to the extent of giving a trial or whether even after the advent of the Reforms India will be kept in the same state in which there will be different warring sections among Indians themselves, the section which is for co-operation and the section which is against co-operation and so on. I am urging for a speedy disposal of the business, so that we might be sure as to where we stand, and the uncertainty which has been protracted for the last six years may come to an end. I should also like to urge in support of the Memorandum one other point and that is the necessity for the incorporation in the Statute itself the further stages of Constitutional progress of India. My object in doing this is that they should not have this doubt and hesitation through which we are now passing every time when Reforms are to be given, and that we may not have the same ordeal of another commission, another enquiry and a series of Round Table Conferences probably throwing everything into the hotch-pot and leaving us in absolute uncertainty as to the future and blocking progress in the meantime. That is why I think it is necessary to urge the need for a provision for future progress, so that we may be quite certain as to what our ultimate goal is, viz., Dominion Status or Self-Government.

"There is just one other point which I should like to refer to in regard to this matter and that is regarding the rights of minorities. I know that the White Paper has been very solicitous about the interests

14th March 1934] [Mr. A. T. Pannirselvam]

of minorities and that His Excellency the Viceroy and His Excellency the Governor have been invested with special powers of protecting the minorities. That comes in as one of the various safeguards on behalf of the minorities. I doubt if this will be the best method of securing the interests of minorities. Would it not have been better if the rights and privileges of minorities had been declared in specific and definite terms in the Act itself so that they may have no doubt as to their position and rights. I therefore suggest that their rights should be declared in the Statute itself and these must be protected by the Governor in cases where they are transgressed or invaded. I ask whether this would not be a proper course, instead of leaving the matter in the hands of the Governor and hoping that he will, on every occasion, rise equal to the occasion and put a stop to any invasion of those rights. Personally I should say that I would prefer these rights being incorporated in the Act itself by reason of the experiences which we of the minorities have had under the present Constitution. With the very best of intentions towards minorities, I believe that it would not be always possible for the Governor to come to their rescue. Even under the present Constitution, when the Governor is invested with much larger powers, the minorities have been driven to the necessity of ventilating their grievances, on more than one occasion, either in the Council Hall or outside. The trammels of office of the Governor and the defects of the Constitution may probably prevent the Governor from taking any personal action which he might otherwise like to take in safeguarding the interests of the minorities. I feel, Sir, that under the coming Reforms, with an autonomous Province and with a Ministry which is responsible to the House, the position of the Governor will be more a constitutional one and he will be less inclined to interfere with the activities of the Executive. Therefore, I feel, Sir, that the protection which is afforded to minorities in the nature of Governor's special powers will not give them the same guarantee which they would otherwise have, if their rights were incorporated in the Statute itself.

“ There is just one point on which I should like to express my dissent from the Joint Memorandum, viz., the necessity for Second Chambers in the Provinces. Personally I feel that any autonomous State would be better off for a Second Chamber and in the future Provinces which are to be autonomous and whose Governments are almost uncontrolled except by the advice of the Legislature, the need for a Second Chamber becomes all the greater. The usual arguments advanced in favour of a Second Chamber are too well known to need repetition. The need for well thought out legislation, the need for a revising chamber and the need, in fact, to act as a break on certain occasions is always felt. Talking of our own Province, without the least desire to cast any disparagement on the work of this Legislative Council, can we not recall instances of legislation, even under this limited Constitution, instances where, not long after the Act was passed, we had not regarded it as our own Act? I will only refer to the Local Boards and District Municipalities Act. It is only as recently as 1930 we went through a

[Mr. A. T. Pannirselvam] [14th March 1934]

11-45
a.m.

wholesale process of revising the constitution of municipalities and district boards. We inserted in it a provision whereby the president and chairman could be removed from office by a vote of no-confidence passed by the municipal council or the district board. Not very long after we found that that was a faulty piece of legislation and by an amending Act we took away those untrammelled powers from the hands of local bodies and vested them with restricted powers. Recently we have found the necessity of once again recasting the Local Boards Act and the Municipal Act. Again, Sir, with regard to tolls, we thought we had reached the millennium when the Bill abolishing tolls was passed, but almost since the Act was passed, we have been regretting the abolition of tolls. I am referring to these instances merely to show how even under this limited Constitution where we have to obtain the previous sanction of the Governor or the Governor-General for our Bills, we have passed hasty legislation. When such is the case, what would be the position under the new Constitution when the Provincial Government will be autonomous and free from outside control and therefore can pass any legislation it pleases at a moment's notice? The need and urgency for a Second Chamber which will act as a check on hasty legislation, revise it, if need be, or remit it back to the First Chamber, are very great. A Second Chamber of the description I have given, it seems to me, will not be a superfluity at all. Therefore, with this one reservation on the question of a Second Chamber, I lend my whole-hearted support to the Joint Memorandum submitted to the Parliamentary Committee by the Indian Delegation."

* Mr. DANIEL THOMAS:—"Mr. President, Sir, there is one point about which all sections of opinion in this House as well as outside in the country are unanimous and that is the urgent need for the early introduction of the new Reforms Scheme. There is a proverb that hope deferred maketh the heart sick. I may say, Sir, that the heart of the Indian peoples are growing very sick indeed at the delay and the tardiness with which the new Reforms Scheme is being worked out in England. I am told by my hon. Friend here that the nominated Members may not agree with me, but I am sure that the nominated Members have a keen sense of progress and are truly patriotic enough to agree that there is urgent necessity for the speedy introduction of the Reforms Scheme. I am confident there is not one nominated Member in this Council who will not be able to win the suffrages of the people when all the seats in the Council are thrown open to election.

"The next point on which I should like to say a few words is the 'dual policy' of the Government of India. Over and over again the Government of India have said that their object was to do everything in their power to maintain Law and Order and put down the Civil Disobedience movement on the one hand and on the other hand to promote the progressive realization of responsible Government in this country. I may say, Sir, that during the last two years the first part of this policy of the Government has been eminently successful and at the present time Law and Order has been supremely vindicated throughout the

14th March 1934]

[Mr. Daniel Thomas]

country. But at the same time, the Government should not be forgetful of the other policy which has been asserted with equal fervour and that is the progressive realization of Self-Government, Dominion Government for this country. I am afraid that, of late, the tendency in this direction as can be gathered from the trend of events is not quite reassuring. It appears—I hope and trust it may not be true—that the Government of India having secured the success of one part of the policy is not now so keen or so enthusiastic as it was at any rate, as regards the other part of the policy, namely, the early introduction of the new Reforms.

“ With reference to the actual proposals in the White Paper and the Memorandum submitted to the Joint Parliamentary Committee by the Indian Delegation, I want to say a few words. If in the new Constitution there is going to be any reservation with regard to the transfer of Law and Order, I am sure, Sir, that the country as a whole would rather prefer to go back to the pre-Reform days rather than have a Constitution with Law and Order reserved. Because that would mean that, in spite of all these years of Dyarchy, the people of the country and the statesmen of the country are so backward as not to be entrusted with the administration of Law and Order. It would be a blot on the Indian escutcheon and rather than have such a stain on us, we would prefer not to have any Reforms at all with the reservation of Law and Order. As has been pointed out in the Memorandum to the Joint Parliamentary Committee, Law and Order is not a thing which can be separated and isolated from the other departments of the Government. It is not like a thing which a scientist can analyse and separate into various parts. It is not capable of being dealt with by a microscope in isolation. The subject of Law and Order is intimately connected with all the other subjects. As has been pointed out, in Bengal and in the Punjab and may be in other Provinces, any action taken in connexion with Law and Order has its reactions and repercussions on all the other subjects which are transferred to Ministers. This is an additional reason why the subject of Law and Order should not be reserved.

“ I want to say a few words with regard to the institution of a Second Chamber in the Provinces. This question has been receiving very great attention and has been discussed at length in the country. I believe the large majority of people are against a Second Chamber. We have the history of the English people before us and we know that time and again there have been many conflicts between the House of Lords and the House of Commons. Such conflicts and crises have been got over only by the innate good sense and the spirit of compromise of the Englishman. After all the compromise between the House of Lords and the House of Commons has been effected only by making the House of Lords for all practical purposes an absolutely powerless body. It has been called a gilded Chamber of invalids and therefore for all practical purposes, the House of Lords is not playing any real part in the evolution of English political life. We do not want such a mistake to be repeated in India. On the other hand, if the Second Chamber is to be a really effective and powerful body, there is likely to be friction between

[Mr. Daniel Thomas]

[14th March 1934]

the two Chambers. Especially at a time when we are going to launch a new scheme of Reforms, the success or failure of which will be keenly watched by friends and foes alike, we should carefully avoid adding anything to the Constitution which is likely to create friction and conflicts. It has been said that the First Chamber might pass hasty legislation which would require revision. It has been pointed out that even in this very Council there have been occasions when we have passed hasty legislation, which in the light of after-events had to be revised. In such cases, it is open to the single Chamber itself to judge whether revision is necessary or not in the light of subsequent events. Just as this Council revised its own measures when occasion required it, the future Councils also may be trusted to do the same. It would be much safer to leave this revisionary work also to the Chamber which passes the original legislation, if in the light of after events it thinks that revision is necessary. The tendency will be for a responsible body like the Provincial Council not to readily agree that revision is necessary merely because the defects are pointed out by an outside body, although later on it may be willing to agree that revision is necessary. That is nothing but human nature: things done by oneself are taken to be correct and one is not too ready to listen to directions from outside sources. I think therefore that in the interests of the future political development, harmonious working is necessary and it would be much safer to have a single Chamber especially for Madras. Of course conditions in other Provinces may be different, and whether Second Chambers are or are not necessary in the other Provinces, I am sure the people of those Provinces and the responsible statesmen there will discuss and decide for themselves. But so far as Madras is concerned, this is a Province in which we have been priding ourselves as being the vanguard of political progress and we can surely set an example of a single Chamber Constitution working satisfactorily.

“ I want to say a few words with regard to the representation of the Indian Christian community in the new Councils. During the last budget session, the Council, on the motion of Mr. Sreshta passed an almost unanimous resolution with regard to the inadequacy of the representation of Indian Christians in the new Legislatures. I hope and trust that the authorities will give due consideration to the claims of the Indian Christian community in this matter.”

* MR. M. S. SRESHTA:—“ Mr. President, Sir, I shall not deal with the three questions involved in this cut motion as they have been ably discussed by other Members and as I do not wish to tax the patience of the House. I shall confine my remarks to the question of the representation of the Indian Christian community in this Council. It has been a great grievance of the Indian Christian community that they have been ignored both by the majority community and by the other minority communities in this matter. Whereas the Muslim community has got an increase of about 300 per cent and whereas the Depressed Classes are getting similar increase, the Indian Christian community is

14th March 1934]

[Mr. M. S. Sreshta]

not getting much of an increase in the new Council. Our present number is 7, 5 elected and 2 nominated; but the two nominated Members happen to be members of the Depressed Classes. But from the time when the Depressed Class members have been nominated to this Council, two at least have been Indian Christians. But in the new Constitution no member of the Depressed Classes would be Christians. The result would be that we shall have to depend entirely on election for proper representation of our community. At the present moment we have 7 Indian Christian Members in this Council. This number has been increased to 9. I think it will be quite clear from the figures I gave in my speech made on the 23rd March last year, that the number allotted to our community is quite inadequate. How it has happened that our community has been given this small number is very difficult to understand. It has been recognized that minorities should have weightage given to them. Whether it is right that minorities should be given any special representation or not, whether they should be given weightage or not, is not a matter which can be reopened and decided. In the old constitutions of the world there was no special representation for minorities. The Great War demonstrated the necessity for giving proper representation to minorities in various countries. But since the Great War and since the League of Nations has been constituted, minorities are given special consideration. In the States of Czechoslovakia and in the other new States formed after the Great War, it has been recognized that racial, religious and linguistic minorities should be given not only proper representation but also weightage. They are given special consideration not only in politics but also in the matter of education. In these States I have referred to, wherever forty pupils of a minority community require a separate school to be established for them it is established as early as possible. Not only that; when an application has been made and if no decision has been given within a certain period, say, one or two months, an appeal lies to the League of Nations. It will be seen therefore how the rights of minorities have been conceded after the Great War; and it stands to reason that the same principle should be applied to minorities in this country. That this should be so, is not denied; this principle has been applied in the case of Muslims. I am not envious of them; this principle has been applied in the case of the Depressed Classes. But this principle has not been applied in the case of Indian Christians. It may perhaps be due to the fact that only two Indian Christians were at the Round Table Conference and as they held entirely opposite views on many matters they were not able to achieve anything. But it is a great credit to the Indian Christian community that they ignore themselves as a minority community and think of bigger questions. It is rather a hard lot that our community—because we want to be cosmopolitan or liberal—is entirely ignored. According to the recommendation of the Madras Franchise Committee, the number allotted to the Indian Christian community is 11; the Madras Government reduced it to 10; when it went to the British Parliament, this number was reduced to 9. Whereas the Muslim community at every stage got an increased number, whereas the

[Mr. M. S. Sreshta]

[14th March 1934]

Depressed Classes also got increased representation every time, our community got less and less number each time. Whatever error was made with regard to the Muslim community was corrected by the Communal Award. In the case of the Depressed Classes also, they did not at first get the number wanted but this was corrected by the Poona Pact; but in our case neither the Government nor a Poona Pact came to our help.

“ This question was raised on the floor of this House on the 23rd March last year; then I pointed out that our community had not been properly and equitably treated. I shall not repeat all the arguments I then gave; but to the great credit of this House there was a unanimous resolution passed that we should get the number we wanted, namely, eleven at least. One Member of the Indian Christian community said that the number should be 15. There was no objection raised to this resolution. As I said, it was unanimously passed. In the Communal Award it was stated that the decision arrived at by that Award should not be varied except with the consent of all communities concerned. That is the reason why the number of representatives of the Depressed Classes was increased as a result of the Poona Pact. I should like to point out that the unanimous resolution of this Council is equivalent to the consent of all the parties and interests affected. I think the Members of this House feel that they should not stand in the way of justice being done to the Christian community. I should like to point out to the Government in all earnestness that they should consider this resolution as equivalent to the consent of all the interests affected to increase the number of representatives of the Indian Christian community. I believe representations were made by the Indian Christians to various bodies, to the Round Table Conference and to Parliament. Many of these representations were sent through the Madras Government. I should be glad if the Hon. Member in charge will in his reply state what exactly the Madras Government did in this matter.

“ I wish to bring home to the Members of this House to-day the desirability of supporting my motion. Muslims have now got 29 members as against 13 they formerly had. That is much more than double the present number. As against 11 which the Depressed Classes have now got they are going to get 30. But we are only getting an increase from 7 to 9 members. Is it possible for the Indian Christian community to be properly represented with only 9 members? I wish to refer to another point in this connexion. I think it is the policy of the Government to see that the electorate is small. If the whole Presidency is to be represented by 9 members of the Indian Christian community, a number of districts will have to be represented by one man. The result is the member has to go to many districts to find out the needs of the people and it is a very difficult matter. I think there should be a minimum. Nine members for the large number of districts we have got is absolutely inadequate. That is another consideration that has to be taken into account. I trust the Hon. the Revenue Member will kindly consider the arguments adduced by me now and on the last occasion I spoke on this matter and see that justice is done to our

14th March 1934]

[Mr. M. S. Sreshta,]

community, and that every possible step is taken to get out representations considered favourably. No doubt we want the new Reforms to be expedited. I am at one with hon. Members in urging that the new Constitution should be given to us as early as possible. But what is the advantage of a new Constitution with an act of injustice at the very start? I say, 'let the Constitution come.' You know, Sir, what power we have in this House. We, the Members of the Indian Christian community, feel that we are an utter minority and that we have no voice whatever in any important matter. Whatever we want, we cannot claim as a matter of right; we have to beg for them. Even under the new Constitution we will be in the same position as we are now. Therefore, I trust that, while the new Constitution is expedited, steps are taken to remove this blot from the new Constitution and to see that our community gets justice which it requires."

Mr. BASHEER AHMED SAYEED:—"Mr. President, Sir, the question with which we are concerned to-day is not the details of the White Paper proposals, nor the details of any other Constitution that is going to be given to us by the British Government. We have already discussed at great length the proposals contained in the White Paper and we have expressed our view that in many respects they are very unsatisfactory. Particularly with regard to the safeguards we have stated unequivocally that they are not consistent with the best interests of India; nor are they consistent with the real transference of power from the British tax-payer to the Indian tax-payer. But what we are directly concerned with to-day, particularly at this stage after the three Round Table Conferences and after several sessions of the Joint Parliamentary Committee, is the delay that is caused by the Constitution-Makers. Six years have already elapsed ever since the programme began. Now our interest is to make the Government realize the danger in further delaying the new Constitution. There are instances where Constitutions have been brought into existence within a shorter time than what is taken now by the Government in the present case. We have before us the example of the Ceylon Constitution; how quickly it was conceived and how quickly it was given effect to need not be reiterated now and here. If the Government are really serious and sincere that the discontent must be allayed, there should be no more delay and no more suspense in the minds of the people; they should usher in the Constitution very quickly. There is one great impediment which seems to trouble the Government. But I submit that we are not concerned with that impediment very much. What we urge now is 'let the Government give us Provincial Autonomy thereby meaning complete Self-Government so far as the Provinces are concerned; then the idea of Federation may be considered at a later stage. The idea of Federation seems to be a great obstacle; that is the main cause, I believe, for the delay in ushering in the new Constitution. I do not think the idea of Federation has been well conceived so far as this country is concerned. I would therefore reiterate on this occasion that the idea of Federation between the British Provinces and the States must be given up and that a Federation should be started so far as the British Provinces are concerned. To-day in the

[Mr. Basheer Ahmed Sayeed]

[14th March 1934]

12-15
p.m.

Provinces there are circumstances and factors which go to make up for a Federation; it is open to the Government to bring about a Federation of the British Provinces; there are circumstances which will justify the speedy organization of a Federal Constitution so far as the British Provinces are concerned. In short, my point is that the British Government should try here and now the experiment of Federation of the British Provinces and then leave it open to the States to have a Federal Constitution for the British Provinces and the States. That is an easy way of solving the problem. I am sure the report of the debates here on this point will be sent to the Secretary of State and that the Government themselves here will take some steps to expedite this matter. What I am anxious to know on this occasion is whether the Hon. the Revenue Member, who is in charge of this subject, is in the know of anything at all, whether this Government are in a position to say anything with regard to the programme which the British Government have in view with regard to the new Constitution, at any rate with regard to the question of Autonomy to be given to the Provinces; that is what we are concerned with vitally to-day. We want that, whatever might be the position so far as this Province is concerned, so far as the main issues of the Indian Constitution go, something definite should be known to us as early as possible. Already the life of this Council has been extended by one year, and we understand that the Assembly is going to be dissolved in the month of April. If that is true, it is not really in the interests of the public and the tax-payer, nor is it in the interests of the Government. It is not proper that a Council that was constituted for a period of three years should be extended indefinitely and that things should be so adjusted that one or two more elections are to take place before the new Constitution comes into existence.

" There is another factor which seems to be in the way of the new Constitution coming into existence early. That is: there has been no agreement between the majority and the minority communities in the country. If only the old experiment of 1919 had been tried and if the majority and minority communities had come to an understanding on that basis and submitted a scheme, probably all this delay could have been avoided. I would therefore appeal to the majority community that, having already lost enough time, they should not lose any further time, but come to some understanding with the minority communities, and put forward before the Government a joint scheme which will not give room to the British Government to make any further delay.

" As for the claims of the Christians which have been so ably advocated by my Friend from South Kanara and the Member for Central districts (Christian), I do not have any objection at all. It is open to them to agitate and get whatever they want. But the proportion that has been given to them shows that they are sufficiently represented. So far as the Indian Christian community is concerned, I think their representation is enough and more than required. So far as the Christians are concerned, we have the European Christians, we have

14th March 1934]

[Mr. Basheer Ahmed Sayeed]

the planters and so many others; if all the Christians are taken together, I am sure they will outnumber the Muslims; there is no doubt about that. But historical events and historical facts cannot be ignored. All the same, I have the least objection, and my community will have the least objection, to the Christians getting an equal proportion with us or even more. It is all left to them to get whatever they want.

“ I shall refer to one more point and be done. I want to know from the Government in a definite and categorical manner whether they have been taken into confidence by the British Government, whether they know of any programme which will give us an idea as to when we can reasonably expect the new Constitution to be brought into existence, and what the form and shape of it in a rough manner would be.”

* Mr. C. BASU DEV:—“ Mr. President, Sir, I am grateful to you for giving me this opportunity to make a few observations on the future constitution. I shall try and confine myself mainly to the question of representation of labour and leave the bigger issues to the constitutional pandits among whom, by the way, there is great confusion and disagreement.

“ Before I say anything further, I may tell my hon. Friend, Mr. Sreshta, that whatever may be the adequacy or inadequacy of the representation in the future Councils of the Indian Christian community, the advocacy of their claims has not been inadequate in this House. Mr. Pannirselvam started it, and was strongly supported by Mr. Daniel Thomas and Mr. Sreshta.

“ Sir, a good deal of criticism has been levelled against the Government for the delay in the inauguration of the new Reforms; and most of the blame is evidently sought to be put upon the British Government. I would like to ask hon. Members of this House, who is really responsible for this delay? Sir John Simon came out with his proposals some years ago, but the Indian politicians discarded the substance of his proposals for the satisfaction of a sentiment. It is now an admitted fact that the proposals of Sir John Simon in certain respects went far beyond the proposals that have emanated from the long discussions at the three Round Table Conferences. Even at the second Round Table Conference, when there was an opportunity to clinch matters and obtain the maximum instalment of Reforms, that strange combination of a saint and politician, Mahatma Gandhi, stood in the way. To-day, Sir, we are in no better position. On the other hand, thanks to our politicians and to their ever-shifting and interminable discussions we are positively in a worse position. I should like to know if there is going to be any finality to the discussions on the new Reforms. This morning I heard Mr. Yahya Ali pleading for the simultaneous introduction of responsibility in the Provincial and Central Legislatures, while Mr. Basheer Ahmed stated just now that it is far better to have responsibility in the provinces first and think of Federation afterwards. I think unless we make up our minds to leave the whole question of new reforms in the hands of the British Government and the British statesmen, we

[Mr. C. Basu Dev]

[14th March 1934]

cannot blame the Government for the delay. Mr. Basheer Ahmed asked the Government to come forward with the Reforms; but he has not assured the Government that whatever those Reforms may be, he would not obstruct the working of those Reforms. Gentlemen who speak well, emphatically and eloquently about the need for expediting the Reforms are not prepared to give the assurance that they will co-operate in the working of those Reforms.

"I do not want to say anything further on this matter, except to refer to one or two notable converts in this House as regards the proposals contained in the White Paper. Mr. Venkatarama Ayyar, while discussing the White Paper on the floor of this House vehemently denounced the safeguards, yet he was the first perhaps, during the discussion on the Estates Land Act (Amending) Bill to invoke the aid of the very safeguards he denounced and sought and still seeks to get the Governor veto that Bill. My friend, Mr. Hameed Khan, again who was against a Second Chamber became later a convert in favour of that institution."

Mr. ABDUL HAMEED KHAN:—"On a matter of personal explanation, Mr. President, I never said that I was in favour of a Second Chamber; I have already explained that what my friend stated on a former occasion was not correct, and I do not know why he should persist in saying it now."

Mr. C. BASU DEV:—"If my friend, Mr. Hameed Khan, will read the report of his own speech in the Proceedings, I am sure he will not contradict me. Any way, I do not want to pursue that matter any further."

"Coming now to the question of Labour representation under the new Reforms, I do not want to bargain with the Government and say that the number they have given us is inadequate. I would certainly very much wish and my friends both here and outside who sympathize with the worker also wish that there should be more seats allotted to Labour. But whatever it is, the workers are very much left in doubt and anxiety as to the constituencies which will be called upon to select their representatives, and as to the qualifications which will be prescribed for their representatives. Sir, labour movement has been in existence in this country for the last fifteen years, and from my knowledge of that movement and of the workers, I am satisfied that there are among the workers, men capable enough to assume the responsibilities of representatives of the cause of labour in the Councils. I would therefore strongly urge on the attention of those responsible for the new Constitution that they should take into their serious consideration the need for prescribing qualifications for the candidates so as to confine them to the ranks of the workers. However able people like my friend here Mr. Ramaswami Mudaliyar, and myself may represent the workers, the workers have now realized the great need for one of their own men to represent them and their cause. Labour has sufficiently been exploited by the intelligent outsider to his own profit and it would be cruel to allow this exploitation to go on. If I have time, I would unfold harrowing

14th March 1934]

[Mr. C. Basu Dev]

tales of how the worker is bled white by the intelligent and educated exploiter. If labour is to come into its own, it should have in the Councils men from its own ranks. Again, with regard to the constituencies we do not know whether they are going to be regional or vocational constituencies. I think, Sir, in the circumstances now existing in this country, territorial constituency is the only feasible and proper proposition. I would, therefore, strongly urge the formation of territorial constituencies."

* Rao Sahib N. SIVA RAJ:—"Mr. President, Sir, Mr. Daniel Thomas in starting the discussion on this subject, suggested that every Member of this House, whether nominated or elected, and every Member of the public was very keen on the acceleration of the Reforms. I fear, Sir, that while it may be true in some cases, the indifferent attention that is paid to the debate by the Members of this House to-day, and the thinness of the House at the present moment give the lie direct to that suggestion. Probably there is another reason: that is, that people are tired of asking for Reforms and of knocking at the door of the Government. If that be so, I hope it is only a temporary lapse. Assuming, however, that the public generally are keen about accelerating the Reforms and that we in this House are keen on suggesting improvements to the White Paper, I still am afraid this is not the proper stage to do that. We have reached a certain stage, sufficiently advanced, when the whole thing has passed out of the hands of the Indian Nation and is now in the hands of His Majesty's Government. As it is, we find that Mr. Churchill has come out again with an attack on the White Paper itself; while the Secretary of State and His Majesty's Government are trying to make out the best case they can for India as against that growing opposition in the conservative ranks. I sincerely feel that it is time that the Indians as a whole, without going into the very many details that would certainly improve the White Paper, helped the Secretary of State at the present moment in trying to get what he can from the Conservatives themselves. There are very many useful suggestions that could be made to improve the proposals contained in the White Paper. As a matter of fact, in the very many eloquent and instructive speeches that have been made so far, we find that very useful suggestions have been conveyed. I feel, however, that at this stage, any suggestion to make ought to take the form of a recommendation in order to help His Majesty's Government and the Secretary of State in trying to get what we want for India.

"So far as the question of representation of the minority communities and of the Depressed Classes in particular is concerned, we are not yet sure that what is supposed to have been achieved by the Poona Pact is really going to benefit our community. That is still a matter of doubt. Every one knows that the Poona Pact was brought into existence during a peculiar crisis, and it still bears the impress of that crisis. My own feeling is that, even though I was one of the signatories to that Pact, the time has now come when we should take stock of the whole position and try to recast that Pact so as at least to suit the conditions obtaining in this Presidency. I was very much disappointed to see

[Mr. N. Siva Raj]

[14th March 1934]

that on the question of the Temple-entry Bill, the opinion in our Province was so overwhelmingly against it; and it is time that we thought of revising the Poona Pact itself. Still for the present, I feel that our discussions here, while they show a good knowledge of constitutional principles on the part of Members of this House, are not going to be of much practical use at the present moment."

12-30
p.m.

* Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN:—"Mr. President, Sir, I am most thankful to you and to the House for having taken up this motion for discussion; because this is the only opportunity the Council would have of discussing the White Paper proposals and the Joint Memorandum of the British Indian Delegation. I am glad, Sir, that the Hon. Members who have spoken before me have supported the Joint Memorandum; and the fact that this motion was proposed by one Mussalman Gentleman of this House and supported by another Mussalman Gentleman shows at least in this respect that we, Indians, are united in our demands with regard to future constitutional progress. I believe this resolution was further supported by my hon. Friend, Mr. Pannirselvam, who represents a Christian constituency and has spoken in the same way as other members of his community have done. I am told by my hon. Friend from Coimbatore (Rao Bahadur T. A. Ramalingam Chettiayr) that almost all of them belong to the minority communities. This shows that the minorities are at least agreed that the Joint Memorandum is a concerted production of the British Indian Delegation and the Council as a whole is willing to support that Memorandum. Mr. President, it should also be made clear that this Memorandum is not a hasty Memorandum drawn up by what people call 'agitators.' On the other hand, the Memorandum has been signed at the head by His Highness the Aga Khan, whose claim to represent not only the Muslim community but the whole of India has been recognized by many conferences held in this country after he came back from his labours at the Joint Select Committee. Mr. President, the House will bear with me when I read out some of the passages in the Joint Memorandum which will go to show that the claim made by the Authors of the Joint Memorandum are the minimum that will allay public opinion in this country and satisfactorily solve the Constitutional problem as it stands to-day. The Memorandum first begins by quoting the declarations of His Majesty's Prime Minister at the end of the first Round Table Conference which was affirmed afterwards by the National Government:

'The view of His Majesty's Government is that responsibility for the Government of India should be placed upon the legislatures—Central and Provincial—with such provisions as may be necessary to guarantee, during a period of transition, the observance of certain obligations and to meet other special circumstances, and also with such guarantees as are required by minorities to protect their political liberties and rights.

'In such statutory safeguards as may be made for meeting the needs of the transitional period, it will be a primary concern of His Majesty's Government to see that the reserved powers are so framed and exercised as not to prejudice the advance of India through the new constitution to full responsibility for her own Government.'

Therefore, what the Members of the Indian Delegation had in mind was to carry out the declaration of His Majesty's Government and to

14th March 1934]

[Dr. P. Subbarayan]

see that no impediment was placed by the new Constitution in the path of India's progressing to her final goal, that of Dominion Status. One of the requests that the British Indian Delegation has made is that, as was done in the preamble to the Government of India Act, in the preamble to present Act, there should be a statement that the natural issue of India's Constitutional progress is the attainment of Dominion Status and they pointed out that they were not going far from the declaration that was made in the year 1921 on the solemn occasion of the opening of the new Central Legislature. This is the message of His Majesty the King Emperor conveyed by His Royal Highness the Duke of Connaught at the time:

'For years, it may be for generations, patriotic and loyal Indians have dreamed of Swaraj for their Motherland. To-day, you have beginnings of Swaraj within my Empire, and widest scope and ample opportunity for progress to the liberty which my other Dominions enjoy.'

Therefore, it is plain that the British Indian Delegation did not ask for anything more than had been repeatedly promised by His Majesty's Government and the declaration made by His Majesty's representative. It has been stated that in the matter of the reserved subjects, that is, the Army, Ecclesiastical Department and other subjects, the safeguards should be such as should not impede the progress of India to Dominion Status. As has been stated by the Right Honourable the Secretary of State for India, the Prime Minister and Mr. Baldwin, we want the Indianization of the Army, in consonance with the safety and security of India, to be made as rapidly as possible because ultimately the attainment of Dominion Status will depend upon the rapid Indianization of the Army. The Delegation therefore proposed that methods should be adopted which would procure that ultimate goal of the Indianization of the Army within the next quarter of a century. They proposed that the Army Counsellor should be a non-official Indian, preferably an elected Member of the Federal Legislature, or one of the representatives of the Indian States in the Federal Legislature. There should be a definite programme of Indianization with reference to a time-limit, say, of twenty or twenty-five years, and one of the primary duties of the Army Counsellor should be the provision for training of Indian Officers for the programme of Indianization. I think in these two paragraphs they put in a nutshell the reasons why the Counsellor in charge of the Army portfolio should be an Indian. The reason they adduce is that if an Indian is in charge of the Army he will get into touch with the Federal Minister and be able to tell His Excellency the Viceroy what the feelings of the representatives in the Legislature are in regard to Indianization of the Army and also try to co-ordinate the work of the Army Department in order to make rapid Indianization possible. They go on to say with regard to the Financial Adviser, who is to be appointed to advise His Excellency the Viceroy, that he should be appointed in consultation with the Federal Finance Minister for the reason that the Financial Adviser should not only advise His Excellency the Viceroy but he should also be the Financial Adviser of the whole Government so that his advice would be available on all matters to the Federal Finance Minister. Also there should be no clash between

[Dr. P. Subbarayan]

[14th March 1934]

His Excellency the Viceroy and the Federal Government in the matter of safeguarding the financial interest of India. They have also pointed out that the debt of India is such that it is secured and it would be in the interest of the Federal Government itself to see that there is no financial breakdown and that everything should be done to put the credit of India on a fairly substantial basis, so that the financial credit which is enjoyed by the present Government of India would continue to be enjoyed by the future Federal Governments. I believe some of my friends have talked about safeguards and I can do no better than to quote Mr. Baldwin. Mr. Baldwin, speaking before a meeting of the Lancashire, Cheshire and Westmoreland Provincial area of the National Union of Conservative and Unionist Associations said:

‘There has been a great talk about safeguards. All the safeguards are being examined by the Joint Select Committee, but whatever safeguards we have, the real safeguard is the maintenance of goodwill. If there is not a basis of goodwill, your trade will eventually wither away, and I regret to say that some of the measures which have been suggested, and which Lancashire people have been asked to support, have, in my judgment been calculated to destroy rather than to further any possibility of that goodwill between Lancashire and India which we can get, which we ought to get, and which cannot do without Whatever a Government may do, you cannot prevent a population nowadays, and especially an Oriental as opposed to an Occidental population, if it considers it has been unjustly treated, from expressing its feelings by refusing to buy goods. The refusal to buy goods, commonly called a boycott, had been brought to a fine art in the East. The Japanese have experienced in China what a boycott means. We have some experience of what it means in India. The causes of the boycott were more than one. The moment the economic condition gets better and the buying power returns, that moment there will be more trade. Besides, that there came in the political elements—and for a time they were a strong force. But that boycott has died away, and it has died away under the double influence of firm Government, but, as I believe still more by a conviction in the minds of the Indians themselves that we were going to deal honourably with them and keep our word about getting on with the Reforms. The moral aspect of that question helped to break the boycott as much as, if not more than, any question of force.’

“I think, Mr. President, Mr. Baldwin has put the case as forcibly as can be put by any hon. Member of this House. Why was the boycott taken off? It is the faith in the word of His Majesty’s Government that India will get substantial advance in the matter of Reforms and that she will be put on the safest landing towards Dominion Status, for which responsible Indians have been working for and if anything happens and the Die-hard elements get power to whittle down the White Paper Constitution and make it a mere shadow of Self-Government and not the substance, then the whole trouble will begin again and as Mr. Baldwin has warned the question of other methods for the attainment of India’s constitutional progress will be attempted. The British Indian Delegation had adduced perfectly sound reasons why such amendments should be made in the constitution as would make it acceptable to public opinion in this country. I am sure the Hon. the Revenue Member, who is in charge of the Reforms Portfolio, would forward the opinion of this Council on this matter to His Majesty’s Government with the discussions thereon and point out that Indian opinion will not be satisfied unless the White Paper is amended at least to the extent put forward by the British Indian Delegation to the Joint Select Committee.

14th March 1934]

[Dr. P. Subbarayan]

“ Of course my friends have spoken on minority representation and Mr. Sivaraj especially referred to the question of the Poona Pact. When the Poona pact was entered into, as Mr. Sivaraj pointed out, there was certainly a national crisis and we, caste-Hindus, are thankful to the members of the Depressed Classes for having helped in the solution of the great problem at that stage by accepting the pact. But evidently my hon. Friends belonging to the Depressed Classes are getting dissatisfied with the progress that is being made with regard to their grievances, especially in the matter of temple-entry. I believe Mr. Sivaraj referred to the question that the majority of Hindus in this province are against temple-entry. I am sorry for such a state of things; and certainly I agree with him. If this is the way that members of the Hindu community are going to treat Depressed Classes, they have every right—and I shall be on their side—to get out of the Hindu community and call themselves a separate community. (An hon. Member:—‘No.’) My hon. Friend says, ‘no.’ May I ask what he has done during these two years for solving this problem? It is all right for the caste-Hindus to cry ‘no’ when this question is raised, but when it comes to the question of practical application, they go inside their doors and say ‘the orthodox do not like it; our women do not like it; our purohits do not like it and such like things and therefore we shall not have it.’ (Hear, hear.) Is this the way in which we are going to solve the problem of the future constitutional progress of this country? If that is so, I would far rather join Mr. Churchill and say that this country does not deserve Reforms. (Hear, Hear.) Mr. President, I am speaking on the basis that we, as a whole nation, feel that we want to govern ourselves. We want to lift ourselves in the eyes of the world as a self-respecting nation and at the same time we are going to prove to the world that the minorities are not going to be crushed by the majority in power. On the other hand, we are going to prove to the world at large that our constitution would be so worked as to make the minorities really feel that they are one of us and that their interests are safeguarded and that if there is Self-Government, it is Self-Government for every one of India’s sons, whether Muslim, Christian, Untouchable, European or any other, as long as he is an Indian. What we want is real Self-Government—Self-Government on the basis of equal rights and equal opportunities for all communities—and I believe the Memorandum of the British Indian Delegation does go a long way towards the achievement of this object. (Cheers and applause.) ”

* Rao Bahadur Sir A. P. PATRO:—“ Mr. President, Sir, after the eloquent words uttered by the hon. the Leader of the Opposition, I do not think I will be able to rouse as much enthusiasm as he has done. This righteous indignation against the caste people treating certain parts of the community with contempt really deserves our attention. Surely, if this ideal is reached, if the far reaching ideal which was portrayed to us in such eloquent terms by the hon. Leader of the Opposition is to be attained, no one would be behind him in this matter of working the principle. Nobody is working for it better than the one person to whom

12-45
p.m.

[Sir A. P. Patro]

[14th March 1934]

the whole world is looking with anxious attention as to what the result he would achieve. By his soul force, he may be able to convert millions and millions of the people of this country. I wish him all success. I wish him God-speed. There are other practical questions to be faced. There are people who are accustomed to do their day to day work and they may not find it easy to respond to the call as they may feel that the traditions of the past might be snapped and that there are some other customs of the nation, which in a single moment we cannot change by the magic-wand. You cannot convert the whole country into a land of philosophy and a land of equality. Surely, that is an ideal which every one should aim at, but it is an ideal after all.

“ Sir, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition stated that all those who have spoken before him, have dealt with the subject that is now before the House, as to the need for supporting the Joint Memorandum submitted by the Indian Delegation to the Joint Parliamentary Committee on the Indian Constitutional Reforms. Very few speakers before me referred to it. Every one in India who has given any thought to the subject will agree that the proposals in the White Paper require improvement; at any rate, as has been pointed out by my hon. Friend, Mr. Basheer Ahmed Sayeed Sahib, the proposals are unsatisfactory in many ways and they require to be improved in some directions. There is no question about that. The only difference of opinion is, in what direction these improvements should be made and in what way those suggestions should be worked out—that is the main difference. It is not that the die-hards of the Churchill group are opposed to the Indian Reforms. In fact they are not. All that they want to see is in what direction improvements should take place consistent with the promises made by British statesmen. If you read the White Paper proposals through and through, you will find, Sir, that there can be no difference of opinion that they make a great advance on the present position and greater than some think and that they will place India on the way to real full Responsible Self-Government. It is for preparing us for that ideal that the White Paper proposals are intended. In the evidence which the Secretary of State for India has given, you will find throughout the high statesmanlike manner in which he has dealt with the subject. In his evidence consisting of three big volumes, he has given the principles on which the future British Indian Constitution is to be based. He has adhered to everything that has been stated in the White Paper which will place India on the way to full Responsible Self-Government. He has not minced matters. He has realized the difficulties that are in our way. Realizing those difficulties, at the same time, he has made suggestions for solving those difficulties. It is not merely raising difficulties, but suggestions have been made by him for solving those difficulties in the admirable and the inimitable way in which he has answered all the questions raised by the die-hards. I may not be considered a bad prophet if I say that in the Parliament, it must not be a very difficult thing for the British Government to be able to carry out the proposals of the White Paper, in spite of the Churchill and other groups that might be making noise against the White Paper.

14th March 1934]

[Sir A. P. Patro]

We have faith in the integrity and the honesty of purpose of the British Nation and the British Nation is not going to go back upon the declarations of their statesmen:

“Sir, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition read from quotations made in the Joint Committee Report. There are other quotations in the Memorandum of Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru. He has gone into the details of the promises and assurances made by British statesmen from time to time. What Dominion Status means in regard to India no one can define at present. So far as India is concerned, we cannot visualize what kind of Dominion Status India could achieve. All that I can say is that there are certain principles which control and guide the administration of Dominions to-day and those can be adopted without any difficulty in India and we claim that as Dominion Status. With regard to Dominion Status as they have got in their own Constitution, it is very difficult to imagine when that form of Constitution would come in, because there is the question of Federation. Now, the Dominions have a different kind of Federation from the one we are aiming at. It is a colossal problem. In India we have several States independent of the British Government. They owe their allegiance to the British Crown; and the provinces are subordinate to the Central Government. Therefore, to have a union of the British Provinces on the one side and the Sovereign States on the other is a very difficult problem and there is no such parallel in the history of the whole world. These two things cannot be reconciled. It is a great problem to reconcile the interests of Sovereign States on one side and the interests of the subordinate Provinces on the other and to bring them into a Federation. My hon. Friend, Mr. Basheer Ahmed, rightly pointed out that the delay in the introduction of the Reforms is due to the attempt to have this All-India Federation. He suggested that British Indian Federation must precede All-India Federation. He said: let the autonomous Provinces be federated together and let responsibility be introduced in the Central Government and let the door be opened for States to come in when they chose. That position was advanced with greater force at the Round Table Conference, but wiser men have decided that the All-India Federation should be formed and it is that that we are now considering. Therefore, I say, Mr. Basheer Ahmed is very right in drawing attention to that. The delay is not entirely due to the selfishness of the British Parliament; it is not due to lack of interest on the part of the British Cabinet; but it is due to the inherent defects in the problem.

“It is true, we all expect that Reforms should be expedited. I have pointed out the great difficulty in order to show how it is not possible for any one to visualize a date on which the Reforms would come into operation. Take, for instance, the relations between the Indian States and the Provinces in matters of finance and in matters of representation. There is the claim of the Indian States to have one-third representation in the Lower House; you have got also the claim of my friends, the Muslims, for one-third in the Lower House. Now, if you take away these two-thirds, the rest of the one-third has to be

[Sir A. P. Patro]

[14th March 1934]

divided throughout British India. Therefore, the British Nation, being a democratic nation, saturated with ideas of freedom and liberty, find it difficult to reconcile these conflicted claims. Again take, for instance, the financial relations—I mean Federal Finance and Provincial Finance. The States do not accept any taxation whatever, and they want that the whole burden of the administration of the Federal Government must be borne by the Federation. But with regard to income-tax and super-tax, they would come in for a share only, after working the Indian Federation for a time. And it is only then they would come in for a share of the taxation. And so far as representation is concerned, they must have their share in the Cabinet; they may pass votes of no-confidence against the Ministers and turn out Ministers of the Federal Government, but yet not pay for the cost of administration and bear any portion of taxation. Therefore, the British Government and the Joint Parliamentary Committee are at great pains in order to ascertain what is the solution for this and how best to reconcile these conflicting interests. I am only giving this as an illustration. These matters should be carefully worked out.

“ Then, Sir, the Joint Parliamentary Committee consists of very able statesmen before whom the Joint Memorandum has been placed. This is the Joint Memorandum of Muslims and a few Hindus. The British Government and the Parliamentary Committee are very carefully considering how best to consolidate the proposals in the White Paper. They say in the concluding paragraph ‘ Our proposals are intended to secure the process of further transfer of responsibility and its continuance, etc.’ No one will dispute that statement. We recognize that during the initial period, which in our opinion should not exceed ten years, provisions in the Constitution must remain unaltered. As the signatories to the Joint Memorandum say, there are practical difficulties in working the Constitution. Take, for instance, the Poona Pact. In the case of the Poona Pact, you will see, that Bengal and certain other Provinces have been so violent in attacking the Pact; they say, it require modification. I say to them that that question should not now be raised. But let us see for ten years; it is only for a tentative period of ten years: It may be one community got an advantage over the other, it may be that the Hindus of a particular Province have lost a few seats. Time after time, we met in conferences and committees and discussed these matters at length, but we could not come to any understanding or agreement and we had to leave the matter to the Prime Minister. The Prime Minister gave an award in the light of the best opinion that was available to him. Probably there may be defects in it, but we must accept it as statesmen and as patriots, and we must find an early solution of the problem by agreement.

“ Then, Sir, coming to the Provincial arrangements referred to in the Joint Memorandum, while we approve of the scheme of Provincial Responsibility contained in the White Paper proposals, our observations and suggestions are confined to matters of detail. Similarly, in regard to the Central Constitution, the Joint Memorandum says that they have accepted the proposals contained in the White Paper, but they would

14th March 1934]

[Sir A. P. Patro]

suggest that further improvement should be made with a view to its smooth working in actual practice. Therefore, Sir, in essence while we accept the Constitution as outlined in the White Paper proposals, we want that certain alterations should be made to see that greater smoothness is there in the working of the Constitution.

“ Sir, I have spoken at length in order to show the difficulties for the delay in the matter of the inauguration of the Reforms. Mr. Basheer Ahmed argued that it is entirely due to the inherent defects. But, Sir, every endeavour must be made by the British Government to arrive at a conclusion so that the impatience that is growing in India and the intolerance that is there may be pacified and removed. If not, we shall be driving the people here in India to despair and the interest that they have been showing in the Constitution will in future be lost. Mr. Daniel Thomas referred to the fact that the British Government, while being anxious particularly in the maintenance of Law and Order, is not doing its best towards Reforms.”

* The Hon. the PRESIDENT:—“ May I intervene for a second? There are only four minutes to put the Demand to vote and the Hon. the Revenue Member has to make his reply.”

* Rao Bahadur Sir A. P. PATRO:—“ While the Reforms are delayed, the repression is carried on vigorously. (Mr. Daniel Thomas: That is not my statement.) That is the sum and substance of your statement. I am sure these two things, both the Reforms and the maintenance of Law and Order, cannot be separate. Unless there is Law and Order, Reforms cannot be carried on smoothly and vigorously.”

* The Hon. Sir ARCHIBALD CAMPBELL:—“ Mr. President, Sir, I do not propose to take up very much of the time of this House because I am quite sure Members of this House realize that the points that have been dealt with in this discussion to-day are not matters the disposal of which lies within the power of this Government. However, there is one point to which I must reply. There is a request for information from Mr. Basheer Ahmed as to whether this Government have been informed of any definite programme for the bringing of the Reformed Constitution into operation. We have not received any such programme and I am sure, Sir, that after hearing Sir Parasuramadas Patro, everyone will realize that it is extremely difficult for any one at the present time to tell exactly when the new Constitution will come into being. We have expected it from time to time and we have been looking forward to it always two or three years ahead, and it has always been receding into the distance. I do not wish to discuss the reasons for the postponement, but I am merely mentioning it as an indication of the great difficulty of foretelling when the Reforms will actually mature. There has, however, been considerable progress in the preparations for bringing the new Constitution into being during the past year.

“ I have listened with interest to this discussion; the speakers have not in all cases supported the proposals embodied in the Joint Memorandum. I think my friend, Mr. Pannirselvam, proposed that there should be Second Chambers in the Provinces whereas, if I remember

[Sir Archibald Campbell]

[14th March 1934]

rightly, in the Joint Memorandum it is said that there should not be Second Chambers even in the three Provinces in which it is proposed in the White Paper to establish them. On the other hand, his colleague, Mr. Daniel Thomas, took the same view as that taken in the Joint Memorandum.

“Members representing the Indian Christian community pressed once more for an alteration of the decision of the British Government regarding the representation of the various communities in the legislatures throughout India. That again is not dealt with in the Joint Memorandum.

“I am sure, Sir, that, although the views of individual Members may differ, as we should naturally expect in any assembly of this size, when the new Constitution is actually brought into being, everyone will combine together and accept that Constitution and work it in the best interests of the country. That will be the result so far as this Presidency is concerned, judging from experience of the past.

“The object of the motion is the discussion of the need for supporting the memorandum submitted to the Joint Parliamentary Committee on the Indian Constitution Reforms. I believe that I shall be meeting the wishes of the House, if I undertake, on behalf of the Government, to forward a report of the discussion which has taken place to-day to the Government of India with a request that that Government will be good enough to forward it to the Secretary of State for India in Council.”

* Khan Bahadur YAHYA ALI SAHIB Bahadur:—“I wish to assure the Government that the purpose in making this motion was not to place any obstacles in the way of Government or to strengthen the hands of the critics of the Government with regard to their White Paper policy. The main object was, as mentioned in the motion, to focus the attention of the Government and the public upon the need for considering and supporting the Joint Memorandum that has been submitted to the Parliamentary Committee. That being the main purpose, I am gratified to see that it has been achieved by this discussion. Sir, before I wind up, I just want to say one word and that is with reference to the remark of Mr. C. Basu Dev. It is not my purpose to charge the Government with the responsibility for the delay in the inauguration of the Reforms. As Sir Parasuramasdas Patro pointed out, it is due to a variety of circumstances, chief of them being the inherent difficulties involved in the problem itself. The request all over the country in the matter of speeding up of the Reforms is due to the craving that the Reforms should come as early as possible. There is no question of charging anybody whatsoever for having caused the delay.

“In view of the assurance of the Hon. the Revenue Member that he would forward the discussion on this matter to the Government of India for submission to the Secretary of State and since the purpose of concentrating attention on the memorandum has been achieved, I beg leave to withdraw the motion.”

The cut motion was, by leave, withdrawn.

The Demand was put and carried and the Grant was made.